

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Hannah Parker,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No.: 6:09-cv-00773-JMC
)	
v.)	ORDER AND OPINION
)	
Magna Innertech-Spartanburg,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant Magna Innertech-Spartanburg's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. # 45], Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Affidavit [Doc. # 53] and Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Sur-Reply [Doc. # 58]. Plaintiff Hannah Parker claims that Defendant terminated her employment because of her race in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a) (2010).

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 64], filed on November 29, 2010, recommends Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. # 45] be granted. The Report and Recommendation also recommends that Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Affidavit [Doc. # 53] be granted in part as set forth in the Report and Recommendation. The Magistrate Judge also recommends that Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Sur-Reply [Doc. # 58] be denied as moot or in the alternative be granted as untimely. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of her right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the

court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 64] and incorporates it herein. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement [Doc. # 45] is **GRANTED**. It also **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Affidavit [Doc. # 53] is **GRANTED**. Finally, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Sur-Reply [Doc. # 58] is **GRANTED** as the sur-reply is untimely.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ J. Michelle Childs
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
January 4, 2011